

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-16, 18-23, 25, 26, and 29 are currently pending. No claims have been amended by the present response, and no new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-3, 5-7, 11, 13-16, 18-21, 26, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0101608 to Whitmarsh, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0040692 to Matsueda et al. (hereinafter, “Matsueda”), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0046065 to Furukawa et al. (hereinafter, “Furukawa”); Claims 9, 10, 22, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitmarsh, Matsueda, Furukawa, and Japanese Application Publication No. 2001-209503 to Shima; and Claims 12 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitmarsh, Matsueda, Furukawa and U.S. Application Publication No. 2002/0032761 to Aoyagi et al. (hereinafter, “Aoyagi”).

Applicants’ Claim 1 is directed to an image forming apparatus comprising in part:

hardware resources used for image formation;

applications for performing processes on image formation; and

a *platform* that exists between the applications and the hardware resources, the platform including an Operating System (OS) and a least one control service to control an execution of each requested processing of the hardware resources according to a function call from at least one of the applications, wherein interprocess communication is performed between the control service and at least one of the applications,

the image forming apparatus further comprising, as one of the applications:

an *information providing part configured to provide, to a client terminal, screen data used for selecting one or more image forming apparatuses* from among a plurality of image

forming apparatuses connected to a network on the client terminal, and configured to store, in a storage unit, information including addresses of one or more of the image forming apparatuses which have been selected by associating the information with functions of the selected one or more image forming apparatuses. [Emphasis Added].

Claim 1 recites that the *image forming apparatus comprises applications* for performing processes on image formation, and a *platform* that exists between the applications and hardware resources. Further, Claim 1 recites that an application includes an information providing part configured to provide, *to a client terminal*, screen data used for selecting one or more image forming apparatuses for image processing.

Thus, as recited in Claim 1, (A) the image forming apparatus includes the claimed applications and platform, and (B) the image forming apparatus is separate from the client terminal to which the application of the image forming apparatus provides the screen data.

The Office Action associates the claimed applications and platform with Whitmarsh's print service print driver and central processing unit (CPU), respectively.¹

Whitmarsh describes that Whitmarsh's client (12) includes an application program (44) configured with a user-selectable print command, and also includes a print service print driver (46).² Further, Whitmarsh describes that the client (12) includes a central processing unit (CPU) for processing of images.³

Therefore, in Whitmarsh, the print service print driver (46) and central processing unit (CPU) are comprised in the client (12). There is *no* disclosure in Whitmarsh that the print service print driver (46) and central processing unit (CPU) are comprised in an apparatus separate from the client (12).

Thus, Whitmarsh does not disclose or suggest the image forming apparatus includes the claimed applications and platform, as recited in Claim 1.

¹ See Office Action dated February 18, 2010, page 3.

² See Whitmarsh, paragraph [0024].

³ Id. at paragraph [0021].

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that any of the other cited references, alone or in combination, does not remedy the deficiencies of Whitmarsh discussed above.

The above discussion regarding independent Claim 1 also applies to independent Claims 14 and 29 because these claims recite features analogous to the features recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of independent Claims 1, 14, and 29 be withdrawn. The dependent claims depending from independent Claims 1, 14, or 29 are patentable for at least the reasons the independent claims are patentable.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648